

From: Margaret Davis
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7 40 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Consolidation Vote

I'm writing to encourage you to oppose any further media consolidation. A democracy needs many avenues of information and diverse opinions if it is to function well. When all methods of communication in a community or country are controlled one or two, news is easy to distort or simply not report. The media is not accountable in the same sense that elected officials are and we need to ensure that no single person or group is given the power to unduly manage public knowledge and sentiment.

Thank you,

Margaret Davis
2324 Ruhl Way
Medford, OR 97504

From: Gary Coburn
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:41 PM
Subject: Proposed Changes to Media Ownership Rules

Dear Sir,

As a private citizen with no financial interests in any media, I want to express my opposition to the FCC's proposed changes to the media ownership rules. *I believe the announced changes will reduce the diversity of opinion and the healthy competition that now prevails in various media markets.* The consolidation of public airwaves in the hands of a few large corporations will be detrimental.

Perhaps you should take note of public opinion concerning the proposed changes BEFORE you vote rather than after. You are trustees of the public airwaves and responsible for ensuring they serve the greater public good and not simply the corporate bottom line.

GE Coburn

From: Carl Dershem
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:42 PM
Subject: Consolidation of media ownership

Having long been a student of history (BA 1993), and interested in public affairs and the media, I am appalled at this attempt to further narrow the range of choice and ownership (pretty much identical given today's climates) in the media

I urge you most stringently NOT to allow the proposed rules change to go into effect. It could have no beneficial effects for the American people, save for the very small portion who will own media outlets or otherwise gain through a narrowing of that ownership (and you know who I'm talking about).

I could go on about further diversifying ownership of the media and reinstating the Fairness Doctrine, but I won't

Carl Dershem
Citizen

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: misho stawnychy
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7 43 PM
Subject: Please uphold consumer interests

Dear Mr Powell

Please do not repeal the cap and allow one company or conglomerate the ability to own more than 35 percent of any market.

We cannot count on decisions made by companies based on profit to represent consumers. The role of government and regulation is to protect the interests of individuals. Otherwise, what is the point of government and your role in it?

There is no beneficial reason for media consolidation besides profit for a small handful of companies.

Thank you for your consideration,

Misho Stawnychy

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, jane.harman@mail.house.gov

From: Gilbert Jordan
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:44 PM
Subject: June 2nd meeting

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

I am writing to urge you to extend the time for public comment concerning the proposed relaxation of rules governing ownership of various media sources. The continued march toward consolidation, concentrating ownership in the hands of fewer and fewer giant media corporations, is a frightening prospect for democracy in this country. I know that you contend that there is remarkable diversity in media opinion available to the public. Yet it is readily apparent in the world of radio that opinion is heavily weighted toward conservative and even reactionary voices. What is to prevent the same happening to newspapers and television news when the Rupert Murdochs of the new media empires impose their agendas on their various outlets? The concept of balance is fast becoming a sick joke, and is inimical to the robust debate and diverse viewpoints which are at the heart of a democracy. I do not understand why there has been so little opportunity for public input on such a profound question. It seems there is unseemly haste in making the proposed changes. I urge you to slow down and allow the necessary time for all sides to be heard in this debate. Too much is at stake for the future of democracy. Thank you
Gilbert Jordan

From: Roland Pasternack
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:44 PM
Subject: June 2nd vote

Dear sirs and madam,

Please delay the June 2nd vote on media consolidation and oppose relaxing the current ownership rules. This vote is very important for the American people, yet there has been little public discussion of this issue. Please delay this vote until the voices of the American public can be heard. I also urge you to oppose relaxing the current ownership rules.

Sincerely,
Roland Pasternack

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Ken Adams
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:45 PM
Subject: Vote no on June 2

I heard the discussion on NPR regarding the upcoming June 2 vote. I believe our citizenry will not benefit nearly as much as the commercial interests in the media will if the regulations are changed. I encourage you and the other commissioners to vote "NO" on June 2.

Dr. Ken L. Adams, Professor of Music

Oklahoma Christian University

PO Box 11000

Oklahoma City, OK 73136-1100

405-425-5531 (tel.) 405-425-5517 (fax)

www.oc.edu/music

<http://www.oc.edu/music>

From: lgoff
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:49 PM
Subject: if the FCC makes the wrong decision tomorrow .

and fills our airways with "The Rush Limbaugh Show" we will all be in trouble. If you screw up we may be out buying Ham Radio's to get our news!!! Our media already covers only one side of everything and now your going to possibly make it worse? If it becomes more conservative it will be nothing but Ca-Ca. For instance, for 3 years now I have been writing the Whitehouse asking why we (the U.S.) are taking Isreal's side? The whole time feeling like I must be some kind of communist to have these beliefs. Are the conservative's in thier own little world or what? 'Cause Sharon is just as wrong as Arafat!!! ARE YOU PEOPLE BLIND??? Do you also control the media? (YES!!!) Do you need me to tell you that Sharon is also a terrorist!! Here ya' go!!! NEWSFLASH!!!! SHARON IS ALSO A TERRORIST!!!! Now I TOTALLY agree that Arafat is a special kind of idiot, never-the-less, they are both wrong. But the media is busy doing so much "butt-licking" that no one ever bothered to report the other side. OOOPS!!!! Until now. .and I'm just wondering . Why now? You conservative's are all of a sudden jumping on the "Palestinian Bandwagon" (Lawrence Welk playing?). Am I a Jew hater? No!! The Jewish people have truly suffered and they deserve a homeland. However, if they are going to make a homeland in the middle of the Muslim World they had better learn to "play nice". AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN TOTALLY WRONG FOR EVER "BABY-SITTING" SHARON IN THE FIRST PLACE. I can't think of anything more stupid than getting into a fight where both sides are "dead-assed" wrong. Who exactly is Sharon's "Puppet" anyway? How was this so "overlooked"? Where the hell have you people been???? Sun City????? Playing shuffle board??????? Shheeeesh . its pathetic.

**Thank God for the BBC!!!!

lgoff
s a tx

CC: president@whitehouse.gov

From: MikeD
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:49 PM
Subject: Clear Channel Communications

I live in Denver, Colorado and have sadly watched as Clear Channel Communications slowly bought out most local radio, tv and newspapers

PUT AN END TO THESE HOMOGENIZED MASSIVE MEDIA CONGLOMERATES PLEASE! THEY DO NOTHING POSITIVE OR LONG LASTING FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Thank you,

Mike Demers

From: Greg Keilin
To: Recipient List Suppressed, @fcc.gov
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:55 PM
Subject: Vote NO on new rules

Commissioner,

I am writing to STRONGLY urge you to vote "NO" on Monday regarding the loosening of FCC ownership rules. This change is clearly not in the public interest, and would benefit a few corporations at the expense of ensuring a diversity of viewpoints in the media.

Sincerely,

Dr. Greg Keilin
Austin, TX

From: Richard Crepeau
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7 55 PM
Subject: FCC Rule Change

Dear FCC Commissioners

We are adamantly opposed to the proposed rule changes for FCC. Our news is already too bland and censored, this would only serve to make it more so. We are appealing to you as people of conscience not to make our democracy, which at present is so at risk, an empty show run by corporations. We implore you to vote NO on Monday.

Melody Johnson and Richard Crepeau

From: Bender, Jonathan
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:56 PM
Subject: Oppose Increased Broadcast Ownership

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

I urge you to oppose the proposed increase in broadcast ownership limits. Such an increase will not serve the public good, by limiting public choice of programming.

To a broadcast company, the advantage of buying more stations is to exploit economies of scale and spread costs across more stations. As programming is the largest expense of a broadcaster, it follows that *programs will be shared across more stations, and hence choice becomes more limited.*

Over the air TV successfully competes with cable. Cable is a fragmented programming source, and the 4 major networks continue to command the largest overall audience. In fact, the growth of the Fox network attests to the continuing appeal to media companies of broadcast. Mr. Murdock would not have entered the broadcast market at the late date that he did because he thought it a poor investment.

The FCC's earlier action in regard to radio ownership - see Clear Channel - has been a disaster to music choice. Vote "No" to greater consolidation of the broadcast TV airwaves.

Jonathan Bender

A motivated 2004 voter

From: crusader
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:57 PM
Subject: against increasring percentage of ownership

Considering the detrimental effect that even current ownership rules have on TV and radio domination by single companies in both smaller and larger communities, the proposal to increase the percentage of stations a single company can own in a given area is *totally against the good of whichever community* would be involved in any future frequency grab. The public perception is that the FCC is in the pocket of special interest groups part of or affiliated with larger media corporations who don't have the best interests of the community at heart, merely the bottom line. Some federal watchdog, seems more like lapdog.

Shame on the FCC for even considering such a course of action

J. Bankston

From: MAJIKJENIE@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjkweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:58 PM
Subject: Re Broadcast Ownership Rules

To Our Honorable Commissioner

PLEASE! I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. I truly believe this would be a dangerous precedent.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. For the sake of our democracy and for our freedom please, I strongly urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Thank you

With kindest regards,

Mrs. Jean Keller

Greenfield, Wisconsin 53220

From: Eddie and Enid Rivera
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:59 PM
Subject: Copy of Letter to the Chairman

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I have read with much interest an article stating that the FCC is considering allowing broadcast groups to increase the number of TV stations they own.

Relax the rules on television station ownership in America is not a healthy option, in my opinion. I believe that the current rules are good, and they give more flexibility and cater to local tastes. Please do not relax these rules. They're good!

Sincerely,

Mrs. Rivera

From: Sssam69@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 7:59 PM
Subject: Regarding radio corrupt practices info before JUNE 2 VOTE, thanks

Dear Kathleen

I just want you to know that putting forward such legislation will only make the recently closed system of radio media(as of wartimes) with no authentic caller/listeners only more homogenous. Therefore a much broader biased conglomerate- with only one opinion for issues to be reported across newspaper/radio/tv media will close the media consumers off from any other unique perspectives regarding their local/global/universal matters of importance.

Please do be careful ,

Thanks for your attention,

Sincerely,

Sam Schwartz

Tustin, CA

sssam69@aol.com

From: Chris Hintz
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:00 PM
Subject: New Ownership Ruling

Dear

I am writing to express my objection to the changes in ownership rules. As a student of Journalism, I feel strongly that this change will be a negative one. If anything, the rules on media ownership should be made more stringent not less

These rules were established, in part, as a reaction to the homogenous media control that allowed dictators to control the flow of information. We should not forget the lessons of history and the long-term dangers posed by a shrinking number of voices in our national media

These rules are not outdated Yes, there are more media outlets than ever before but they are owned by a smaller number of companies

A diversity of media outlets preserves a diversity of opinion. A diversity of opinion keeps democracies strong. Please reconsider this decision

Sincerely

Chris Hintz
Indiana University Graduate School of Journalism
I.U. Graduate School of Public and Environmental Affairs

CC: Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, FCC
FCCINFO

From: Brownwrappings@cs.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:00 PM
Subject: Proposed Deregulation

Please allow us to add our voice in protest to the proposed deregulation of media ownership. We do not feel that it is in the best interests of the public to put so much control in the hands of so few.

Jim and Brenda Browne
718 E Woodlawn Rd
Charlotte, NC 28209

From: mary venegas
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:03 PM
Subject: FCC vote

Dear Mr . Powell,

My name is Maria Venegas I write to you from East Los Angeles, California.

I just wanted to say that I think it is absolutely incredible that you would consider allowing a few major corporations to own the publics information communication As a member of a minority group I thought you would have more compassion for the quality of information that is being distributed Our government has allowed Corporate America to own its people and now it will decide what information we are going to receive I hope that you will reconsider your position and not allow this to happen

Thank You,
Maria Venegas

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Walter Epp
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 05 PM
Subject: media democracy not plutocracy

"Deregulation" is doublespeak for governmental abdication of responsibility and dereliction of duty, resulting in increasing monopolization of control by unelected, unaccountable private parties, and consequently increasing damage to the public interest and democracy.

The essence of democracy is the principle that power must be widely shared. Increasing concentration of power, whether in the media or elsewhere, is antithetical to true democracy.

Broadcast media are granted licenses to use public airwaves on condition that they act compatibly with the public interest. It's the FCC's job to serve the public and ensure the public interest is fulfilled. It is not the FCC's job to give away the store and be candyman to the biggest of media companies. The proposed softening of FCC rules must be rejected.

From: Eric Kristoff
To: FCC FCCINFO
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 09 PM
Subject: media ownership consolidation comment

Dear Mr. Powell, Ms. Abernathy, Mr. Copps, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Adelstein,

I wanted to voice my opinion that I am opposed to allowing major corporations greater control over the voice of the media by allowing those corporations to own an even greater percentage of the media in a single region/market. This consolidation will limit the voices and perspective available to the citizens of the country, and especially inhibit local news, for which there is virtually no other outlet besides local television, radio, and newspaper.

As it is, I find myself turning to foreign news to gain a different viewpoint on world events, since I find U.S. news to be too homogeneous in perspective. This rule change would exacerbate the problem of people not being able to reach their own opinion due to limited perspective. It would rekindle my dwindling faith in the U.S. government by not allowing these ownership rule changes, and to show that our government is not completely run by the wealthy and big business.

Thank you,

Eric Kristoff
Leominster, Massachusetts

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein

From: Russ Bernberg
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8 11 PM
Subject: PROTECT MEDIA DIVERSITY!

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

Currently, FCC regulations allow major broadcast networks to own local media stations, as long as the local stations combined reach no more than 35% of the nationwide audience. The new FCC proposal raises that number to 45%.

Radio stations are a good example of what happens when the regulations on media ownership are loosened. In 1996 Congress relaxed ownership restrictions on radio stations. As a result today 10 media companies now control 67% of radio industry revenues. Today there are one-third fewer radio station owners than in 1996.

With fewer regulations, our media becomes narrower, offering the public less diverse news, opinions and ideas. More local areas will watch, read and hear the same news and views. Less than a dozen large corporations already control the media. With relaxed regulations one company will be able to own the majority of the media of an entire community: the newspaper, TV and radio stations, cable, and primary internet company.

Concentrating media ownership in this way hinders the expression of diverse views, allowing a few media companies to control all of the news and the views. The FCC should prevent this from happening, not help it.

I urge you to maintain diversity and competition in the media.

Sincerely,

Russell M. Bernberg 1583 Fremont Ave. Simi Valley, CA 93065 805-527-4731

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service 2 months FREE*

From: Harold Picken
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:12 PM
Subject: Rules change vote Monday

Ms Abernathy

Please vote against expanding the market percentage ownership
Sincerely,
Harold Picken
hpicken@massmed.org

From: Michael Serres
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:15 PM
Subject: Pending deregulation decision

To the FCC Commissioners

Chairman Michael K. Powell mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein jadelste@fcc.gov

I writing to add my voice to the many others who feel that the pending deregulation regarding media ownership should be voted down. If this passes, I believe it's inevitable that Congress will become involved. Public voice (in terms of private citizen feedback and massive media coverage) should indicate to you that this will not stand.

Please listen to your constituency. Don't allow media monopolization to become any more of a reality than it already is.

Sincerely,

Michael Serres
mserres@hotmail.com

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

From: Norris Coleman
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 8:16 PM
Subject: please vote against proposed changes

Mr Chairman and commissioners.

Please vote no to the proposed changes to the rules on multiple ownership of broadcast outlets, as they will stifle debate, inhibit new ideas and shut out smaller businesses trying to compete

Many thanks and best regards

Norris Coleman,

Austin, Texas

(512)-453-2133